A

IVSTIFICATION
OF THE
City Remonſtrance
AND ITS
VINDICATION.

OR,

An Anſwer to a Book written by Mr. *J. P.*
Entituled,
The City Remonſtrance Remonſtrated.

Wherein the frequent Falſifyings of the ſaid Mr. *J. P.* are diſcovered, the many Charges by him laid upon the Remonſtrance and its Vindicator, diſproved, and the parity and agreement of the Remonſtrance (eſpecially in thoſe particulars ſo much condemned by him) with the Propoſitions, Declarations, Remonſtrances, and Votes, of both or either Houſe of Parliament manifeſted.

By JOHN BELLAMIE.

LONDON,
Printed by *Richard Cotes*, 1646.

LONDON

To the Right Honorable *Thomas Adams* Lord Major, and to the Right Worſhipfull the Aldermen, and the reſt of the Common-Councell of the City, LONDON.

Right Honourable,
Right Worſhipfull,

VPon the 14 of April *laſt, you being in Court of* Common-councell *aſſembled, made choice of a Committee of* Aldermen *and* Commoners *to prepare a draught of* A Remonſtrance and Petition to both Houſes of Parliament, *and to preſent it in Court, to be there either approved or altered, as upon debate ſhould be judged meet.*

In obedience thereunto, the ſaid Committee upon the 20 *of* May *following, preſented it in* Common-councell, *where every branch thereof was taken apart and by it ſelf into ſerious Conſideration, and after three dayes debating in open Court, it was by conſent and approbation of the Court finiſhed, and upon the* 26 *of* May, *in the name of the* Lord Major, Aldermen, and Common-councell *preſented to both Houſes of* Parliament. *Since which time two* Libells *have been Printed againſt the ſaid* Remonſtrance, *the one call'd*, A moderate Reply to the City Remonſtrance, *the other entituled*, The Intereſt of *England* maintained; *In one of which it is charged* to carry a full complyance with His Majeſties wonted Declarations againſt the Parliament; *and in the other*, That a great part of the main Sticklers in it, are ſuch as were alwayes backward to the Parliament, and forced to pay their Fifth and twentieth part; *with many other fooliſh, foule, and falſe aſperſions in them both: Whereupon, (though the unmeeteſt, becauſe the unableſt of many others) I adventured the* Vindication *of it; In anſwer whereof, and in further oppoſition to the ſaid* Remonſtrance, *one* Mr. J. P. *hath ſince publiſhed a Book named*, The City Remonſtrance Remonſtrated, *calling it a* hard-hearted Remonſtrance, *and* a Remonſtrance invective againſt the Parliament, &c. *And*

in Page 29. *charges mee for saying something* (*but instances in nothing,*) concerning the King, the Lords, and the power of the Commons, and what my carriages have been not very long since in Common-councell, &c. *and doth thereby, as it were, in a tacite way, call the Court to testifie against me. All which, hath occasioned me this second time to put pen to Paper, in a further* Justification of your Remonstrance, *and also of its* Vindication, *and to a clearing of my self from those many charges of mutation and change, which* (*to beget a disesteem of what I have written in* Vindication of the Remonstrance) *hee hath laid against me.*

My intention in this my addresse unto your Lordship, *to the worthy* Aldermen, *and to all the rest of the* Common-councell, *is, neither to exasperate you against the person of my opposite, nor yet to seeke protection from you for my self or Books; for if what I have written be not concordable to Truth and true Reason, let both mee and them fall before my Antagonist.*

But being thus publikely charged that I should (*not very long since*) *speak something* (*but what it is, hee saith not*) *in* Common-councell, &c. *as if it were crosse or contrary to some passages in the* Remonstrance, *or to what I have written in the* Vindication *thereof, for saith he,* It makes them that heard it, and observe what your Carriages are now, stand with admiration and amazement at your wheeling thus about.

I doe therefore humbly crave leave to present this my Justification of your Remonstrance, and its Vindication *to your* Lordship, *and to the whole Court of* Common-councell, *and doe appeal to all of you in generall, and to every one of you in particular, to testifie against me, if at any time since I had that undeserved honour and happinesse to be a member of this Court, there ever fell any one word from me, so much as savouring of such things, as by this* Mr. J. P. *I am charged to speak in your presence, and I shall ever remain*

Your Lordships, and this Cities servant

JOHN BELLAMIE.

To my truly Loved and Honoured FRIEND Mr. *JOHN PRICE.*

SIR,

I *Have perused your Book, entituled,* The City Remonstrance Remonstrated, *or an answer to my* Vindication *of the said* Remonstrance, *wherein I perceive you have been very ready to receive whatever Reports, either true or false have been brought unto you concerning my carriage in matters of Religion, even from the day of my birth to the publishing of your Book, and taking them upon trust, (for you have not the least knowledge of any one of the particulars, and many of them relate, I think, to the time before you were born,) without ever speaking one word to me about them, (though wee are professed, and have been long acquainted intimate Friends, and to the best of my knowledge and remembrance, not any time the least offensive word ever passed between us, and now are so neare neighbors that whenever you pleased, in lesse then one quarter of an hour you might freely have communicated to me whatever you had a desire to bee satisfied in) you have, as I conceive, to weaken my esteem, and to render what I have written to bee the more invalid, divulged them to the world.*

Two things I desire in love to represent unto you in this, First, if all that you have written of mee were true, the contrary whereof I shall easily prove when I come to the particulars;

yet I beſeech you conſider how irregular this your proceeding againſt me is, and contrary to the rule given by our Saviour Chriſt, *for you and mee and all Gods people to walke by, in Matth.* 18.15,16,17. If thy brother treſpaſſe againſt thee, goe and tell him his fault between thee and him alone, if he ſhall heare thee, thou haſt gained thy brother, *&c. and mind that of* Solomon, *Prov.* 25.18. A man that beareth falſe witneſſe againſt his neighbour, is a maul, a ſword, and a ſharpe arrow. *Secondly, I pray alſo remember how exceedingly your ſelfe, and all your friends the* Antipresbyters, *have diſtaſted, and by word of mouth often with much diſlike, blamed Mr.* Edwards *for medling with perſonall matters, notwithſtanding his way of writing in this kind, is much different from this of yours, as being of practiſes and matters within theſe few years, ſince they went into that* way of Independency, *and as hee conceives, flowing from their principles (and not as you in this, of things raked up through the whole courſe of their lives) being alſo profeſſedly to diſcover the errors of the times* (viz. Hereſies, Blaſphemies, &c.) *and thereby to preſerve the people from the evill of them.*

Now I pray you put this queſtion ſeriouſly to your own ſoul, whether the ſame act done in the ſame kind by Mr. Edwards *againſt the* Independents, &c. *be a vice and blame worthy, and y t being done by Mr.* J. P. *againſt a* Presbyterian *or a* Remonſtrant, *be a vertue, and worthy commendation; think ſeriouſly of it, and then receive ſuch an anſwer as your owne heart ſhall dictate to you.*

You know Mr. J. P. *how carefull I was of your good name, when about four moneths ſince a report was brought unto mee concerniug ſome opinions of yours in matters of Religion (whether true or falſe I now argue not) that preſently by a godly intimate friend of yours and mine,* viz. *Mr.* James Ruſſell,

I did privately, without the least divulging them abroad, make you acquainted with it: And that very morning after your Book came forth against me. the like report was again publikely brought unto mee in the presence of sundry witnesses; but in stead of taking revenge of you (which God hath forbidden me, Rom. 12. 19. saying, Avenge not your selves, but rather give place unto wrath, for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord) *either by spreading them by reports, or printing them to your disparagement, I did presently, in the presence of Mr.* James Story, *who also heard them reported, tell them to you, remembring that of* Solomon, *Prov.* 1 .9. He that repeateth a matter separateth very Friends; *and desiring to follow our Saviours counsell,* Matth. 7. 12. Whatsoever you would that men should do to you, doe yee even so to them; *and I hope I shall ever make it a rule for me to walk by,* viz. to doe as I would be done unto, and not as I am dealt with.

And therefore in the examination and answering of your Book, I will (though much provoked by you, yet) by Gods grace indevour to be as free from passion or retaliation as possibly I can, well remembring that David, *when* Shimei *cursed and railed upon him, observed much good from God in* Shimei *his great evill, and said,* So let him curse, because the Lord hath said unto him, curse *David*; who shall then say, wherefore hast thou done so? 2 Sam. 16. 10. *So I heartily desire, without the least reluctancy of Spirit against you, as the instrument. seriously to observe, and truly to bee sensible of, whatever is from God in all that you have said, and to lay my selfe in the dust in giving God the glory, both in the acknowledging of any error justly charged upon mee, and of his mercy in my recovery. And I trust that through the goodness of God I shall yet get much good out of that which perhaps you*

inten-

intended, and therefore divulged for more evill, setting before me as a pattern in this to walke by the practice of our Lord Christ, *recorded for our example in* 1 Pet. 2. 21, 23. Who when hee was reviled, reviled not againe, but committed himselfe to him that judgeth righteously; *and with freedome of spirit I do heartily both praise the Lord, and thanke you for your plaine dealing with mee in any thing wherein as you professe, you really and singly intended my spirituall good, and pray the Lord to give you repentance, and to pardon you in every thing wherein in this transaction you have done otherwise.*

Thus with the reall demonstration of my true love and affection to you, I crave your leave to goe on to the answearing of your Book, earnestly desiring that if yet after all wee cannot agree in judgement and opinion, we may still close together in heart and affection, which (whatever the event shall prove) shall alwayes bee the desire, prayer, and endeavour of

Your cordially loving and

faithfull Friend

John Bellamie.

A IVSTIFICATION OF THE City Remonstrance, AND ITS *VINDICATION.*

THE first thing you quarrell withall, is the Title of the Book, *A Vindication, &c.* and this you continue to the latter end of your sixth Page, and (as in the Moderate Reply, so here in this) you endeavour in generall termes to lay low the Remonstrance and its Vindication in the eyes of the people; As in your first page by comparing them to *a bad Cause and its Advocates*, then to the *Kings Declaration, Remonstrances, and their Abettors*, to Absaloms *rebellion against his Father* David, *and* Achitophels *cunning counsell to draw the people after him*, to Demetrius *his plea for* Diana's *greatnesse, and to* Tertullus *Oratory against St.* Paul.

Answ. He passe by the parallels which here you make with the Vindicator of the City Remonstrance, and leave it wholly to the judgement and censure of the judicious Reader, whether there be any

any the least parity in the things and cases by you compared, for I had much rather abide their test and tryall, then in this to bee a pleader of my own cause, and so I come to your application of it in these words: *Viz.*

As it was in the beginning, so it is now; witnesse the present ease, A moderate Reply to the City Remonstrance, in justification of the Parliaments innocencie from the prejudice raised against them by the said Remonstrance, as (say you) *shall bee fully evidenced before we have done.*

Answ. Two things I observe in this: first, that you say, (and therein you lay a charge upon the City) that the City Remonstrance hath raised a prejudice against the Parliaments innocency: And secondly, you further say, that this shall bee fully evidenced before you have done; the first is exprest, as usually you use to doe, onely in generals, which amount to nothing: But I pray consider with your selfe, is not Mr. *I. P.* a Freeman and Citizen of *London*, one who lives, under God, in and by the Trade of the City, and yet so farre to forget himselfe and his duty, as thus to asperse the City and its actions with generall, and yet unjust defamations, and all this under a specious shew of a justification of the *Parliaments innocency*, when as there are clouds of witnesses, and many of them under the Parliaments own attestation, at all times ready to bee produced if required, of *Londons* fidelity, of *Londons* loyalty, of *Londons* unparalleld embowelling, and in a great measure emptying themselves, not onely of treasure, but of blood also, and all this unweariedly from time to time, since the Parliament first sate, to this very day, yea alwayes, with alacrity and freedome both of hearts and hands, for the honour, the defence, the just and necessary occasions of Parliament, and hath not the *Honourable House of Lords*, freely accepted and fully approved most of the particulars in the said Remonstrance, yea, those in speciall, and by name, which you so much oppose, *viz. the suppressing of all Heresies and Schismes, &c.* and promised *to take the other particulars into their serious and speedy consideration*, as by their answer to that Remonstrance presented to them it doth appeare? and hath not the *Honourable House of Commons* also received the said Remonstrance, and promised to give an answer thereunto in due time, and not at any time since its receiving into their Honourable House, by any publike act manifested

nifested to the world the least dislike thereof? and yet must *London Remonstrance* by one of its own members be charged with raising a prejudice against the *Parliaments innocency*?

I pray consider whether by this you doe not first charge the *House of Lords* for their being well satisfied with that, which yet you say, *doth raise a prejudice against the Parliaments innocencie.* And secondly, whether you doe not prejudge the judgement of *the House of Commons*, and therein breake the Priviledge of Parliament, in passing such a sentence, and laying such a charge upon that, which yet lyeth under their consideration: I onely offer these two Queries to your after, or second consideration.

But for all this, you say that this shall bee fully evidenced before you have done.

Answ. I pray remember what it is that in this you promise, and be sure that in the particulars of it you make your Charge good, otherwise you must not bee offended, nor take it ill, if according to the common Proverbe, you be judged to be one of them, which will undertake more in an houre, then you can performe in an age. I appeal to the Reader, whether as yet, either the Moderate reply, or this your Remonstrance Remonstrated, hath in any one instance, which either of you have given, or in all that both of you have done, done any thing which proves that *the City Remonstrance* hath raised a prejudice against *the Parliaments innocency*; and truly you must needs beare with me in this, that I cannot judge your bare word to be of that Authority, as to beleeve it because you affirme it, especially considering *the honorable House of Commons* hath not as yet passed any the least displeasing sentence against it; and *the honorable House of Lords* hath declared, that they are well satisfied with the particulars contained in it. And both Houses of Parliament, since their receiving of this Remonstrance, have in their Propositions sent to his Majesty for a safe & well grounded Peace, even *in terminis*, proposed more to his Majesty for his Royall assent, as unto Reformation of Religion, then the Remonstrants have desired in their second, third, and fourth Petitions, so much condemned by you; for the drift of all that they desire, is but an equall conformity of all the Subjects of *England* to the publike discipline and doctrine set forth, or to bee set forth by Authority of Parliament, as by reference to those three Petitions will clearely

 shew,

shew, but both Houses of Parliament in their great wisdome, faithfulnesse, and care for the publike safety and peace of the Kingdome, have in the fifth and sixth Articles of the Propositions in these words thus proposed; *viz.* Artic. 5. *That Reformation of Religion according to the Covenant, be setled by Act of Parliament, in such manner as both Houses have already or shall agree upon, after consultation had with the Assembly of Divines.* And Article 6 it thus followeth; *For as much as both Kingdomes are mutually obliged by the same Covenant to endeavour the nearest conjunction and uniformity in matters of Religion; that such unity and uniformity in Religion according to the Covenant as after consultation had with the Divines of both Kingdomes now assembled, is or shall be jointly agreed upon by both Houses of Parliament of* England; *and by the Church and Kingdome of* Scotland; *be confirmed by Acts of Parliament of both Kingdomes respectively.* And therefore were I thought worthy to bee of your Councell, I should advise you to bee so ingenuous, as in this to confesse your error, and not to imagine that you see more in the *City Remonstrance*, then either one or both *Houses of Parliament* can yet discerne; and for after times, I would perswade you to forbeare the thus unjust besmearing and falsly accusing that City whereof you are a member, and amongst whom under God you enjoy your livelihood.

You goe on and say, *Thus the moderate Reply meets with adversary upon adversary representing the Author of the said Book, a lyer, because hee tells the truth, a Heretique, a Sectary, because a friend to the Parliament.*

Reply. Truly, these are fine pretences if they were true, to beget a dislike against the Remonstrance, and to ingratiate the opposers in the eyes of the people. But I pray what doe you mean thus to dallie? truly, I must needs say you tread in the same steps which the Moderate Replyer trod in, and it's very probable you doe it with the same feet: name the book and the page if you can, where these things are affirmed, and tell us the truth you have told, for which you are called a Lyer, and where you are called a Heretique, a Sectary, because you are a friend to the Parliament, these your dealings may happily be taking with children and fooles, which discerne not your fallacies, but surely wise men will judge them but weak.

The next thing you fall upon, is in your fourth page, and that is the word Humble Remonstrance, and upon this you descant in some similitudes, as of Court complements, and Cavaliers carriage, and then in plaine termes you call it, *a Remonstrance invective against the Parliament.*

Answ. You are full of charges, though never so false, and liberall in your expressions, though you make nothing good; I conceive you thinke your selfe safe and secure, and perhaps you are so from ever giving an accompt of these your actions to any earthly authority: but yet methinks the words of the ninth *Commandement* should be of some authority to you, and beare some sway with you, *viz. Thou shalt not beare false witnesse against thy neighbour.* If not against a particular person, then sure not against a Corporation, a City whereof your self are a member.

Then you are offended at these expressions, *viz. Two late Libells, published by two Anonymusses;* and you aske why I call them Libells before I prove them so.

Answ. They were so in themselves before I named them so; neither called I them Libells, for any of those reasons which you would have the world beleeve I did. As first, because they are written by an Antipresbyter; nor yet because they containe in them lies, falsities, untruths, though all these in severall instances are in the vindication made good against them; nor because they are little Bookes, nor yet singly, because they are written against the City, or because they are without the Authors Names, but for these two last reasons joyntly and together. A Libell I call that which is an untrue, and therefore an unjust Charge upon or against a Person, a Corporation, a Court, without any name annexed to make good what is there charged; and in this respect I appeale to the Reader, whether I did not truly and justly call them Libells.

Lastly, before you come to the body of the Booke, you have yet another fling against the Title, *A Vindication of the City Remonstrance, that is,* (say you) *a Vindication of that which is invindicable:* And therefore (say you) *better it would bee that both the City Remonstrance, and the vindication thereof were written in ashes with the finger of vanitie, then in marble with the pen of a Diamond, &c.*

Answ. For ought I yet see, it is but one Doctor's opinion, and he

he none of the gravest neither, that the City Remonstrance is invindicable, and what you have said to prove it to be so, I desire the Reader to judge, for truly I cannot discern it. But of this I am confident, that it is approved by the *Church of Scotland*, witnesse the Letter now in Print for all the Kingdome to see, which was sent from the Generall Assembly of the *Church of Scotland*, to the *Lord Major*, *Aldermen*, and *Common-Councell* of *London*, June 18. 1646. manifesting their approbation of it, and thankfulness for it. And sure I may say, it is approved by the generality of the ablest, gravest, and best Citizens of *London*, witnesse their Petition subscribed by eight Thousand, six Hundred, thirty and four of their Hands presented the twenty third of *June*, 1646. to the *Court of Common-Councell*, giving them Thankes for it; testifying their approbation of it, and desiring them to wait upon the *House of Commons* for their gracious answer to it, which Petition is by Order of Court since Printed. And me thinks you should not forget that the same Remonstrance for the substance of it, was not onely well accepted, but also graciously answered by the *House of Lords*. And therefore surely in the judgment of all these, the City Remonstrance is not judged invindicable. But perhaps you are of the minde of *Solomons* sluggard, *Prov.* 26. 16. who was *wiser in his owne conceit, then seven men that can render a reason.* And I make as little doubt, though you judge it invindicable, yet it is and will be approved by all the Reformed Churches in *Europe*, not one excepted. And thus I have done with your Quarrells against the Title, I come now to examine what it is you have to say against the Book it self.

First, in Page 7 you say, *That you shall not finde the Moderate Reply, but the City Remonstrance to bee the disturber of the quiet and peace of the Church and State, witnesse* (say you) *the divisions which it hath wrought in* Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Norfolk *and* Suffolk, &c. And a little after you say, *this did argue the desires of many the prime Promoters of the City Remonstrance, to bee nolesse then to make Divisions, and to disturbe the peace and quiet of the Church and State.*

Answ. Whether there be any Divisions in those Counties, or what hath occasioned them, I neither know, nor yet ever heard of; but if any such bee, I desire the Reader seriously to consider,

whether

whether in all probability the Reply, and not the Remonstrance hath raised those disturbances, for the Subject of the Remonstrance is an earnest desire of the settlement of government, by one Uniforme Law, for all the Subjects of *England* to submit equally and alike unto, which I am sure must needs tend to peace and quietnesse, but the drift of the Reply is quite contrary, and therefore without all peradventure it's this, and its abettors, and not that and its promoters, which hath desired and occasioned these Divisions both in Church and State.

In pag. 9 you go about to shew that the *Common-Councell* by their Remonstrance, *did act in a direct, evident, and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God*; and for proofe of this in page 11 you give us some Scriptures, and some passages in the Remonstrance, which you say, or at least would have the world beleeve, is in a direct, evident, and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God; but you never tell the reader how, or wherein they are so, but thus you deliver them.

LET US TRY THEN:

WORD OF GOD.	CITY REMONSTRANCE.
Rom. 14. 5. *Let every man bee fully perswaded in his owne minde.*	That as we are Subjects of one Kingdom, so all may bee equally required (*and here to delude the Reader, you insert, without making the least change of the character, these following words, as if they also were in the Remonstrance*; viz. *be they perswaded in their own minds, or not perswaded*) to yeeld obedience to the government set forth, or to be set forth by the Parliament.

Now I shall wholly all along in these your Parallels, leave it to the judgment of the Reader to consider, whether there be such an antipathy between these Scriptures, and those Petitions of the Remonstrance, as in the Remonstrance, without your insertion, they are expresst; and crave your leave in the same way of parallel, to set the same Scriptures with some branches of the Propo-

sitions

fiction sent by both Houses of Parliament to the King, and other passages of Parliament, and then desire your judgement, whether they also bee in a direct, evident and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God.

WORD OF GOD.

Rom. 14. 5. *Let every man bee fully perswaded in his owne minde.*

Propositions of both Houses of Parliament, *Article* the 5th.

That reformation of Religion according to the Covenant, bee setled by Act of Parliament, in such manner as both Houses have agreed, or shall agree upon, after consultation had with the assembly of Divines.

Rom. 14. 13. *That no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall, in his brothers way.*

CITT REMONSTRANCE.

That all such Sectaries as conform not to the publike Discipline established, or to bee established (by Parliament, *saith the Remonstrance, but this you leave out,*) may be fully declared against, and some effectuall course setled for proceeding against such persons: *Here,* say you, *is a stumbling block,* viz. *a menace in a brothers way.*

Answ. But why doe you leave out the beginning of that prayer, in the Petition which you cite? it tels you the meaning of the Remonstrants, by the words all such Sectaries, *viz.* Those immediately before mentioned, as Anabaptists, Brownists, Heretiques, Schismaticks, Blasphemers; doe you not by omitting the mentioning of these, indeavour to delude the Reader?

I pray put down that Petition wholly together, and let the Reader be fairly dealt with all, and have it, as in the Remonstrance it is expest, and then see how it is opposite to the Scripture by you set against it.

Rom. 14. 13. *That no man put a stumbling block, or an occasion to fall, in his brothers way.*

That all * Anabaptists, Brownists, Hereticks, Schismaticks, Blasphemers, and all such Sectaries, as conform not to the publike † Discipline established, or to be established by Parliament, may be fully declared against, and some effectuall course setled for proceeding against such persons.

I

I desire here also in a parallel way, to set downe the Scripture by you brought, and a passage or two of the Parliaments, and so desire your judgement, whether they also be in a direct, evident and obvious manner, against the expresse Will and Word of God.

WORD OF GOD.

Rom. 14. 13. *That no man put a stumbling block, or an occasion to fall, in his brothers way.*

Parliaments Declaration upon his Majesties Declaration after the Battaile at *Edgehill*, pag. 659.

*Had not his Majesty (seduced thereunto by that Popish and Prelaticall faction) denyed his consent to the Bil for the Assembly, so often by both Houses presented to him, wee had long since manifested to the world by a well setled reformation, our utter dislike of * Brownisme and Anabaptisme.*

Remonstrance of the State of the kingdom, page 19.

We do declare, that it is far from our purpose or desire, to let loose the golden reynes of + discipline and government in the Church, to leave private persons, or particular Congregations to take up what forme of Divine Service they please, for wee hold it requisite that there should be throughout the whole realme, a conformity to that Order which the Laws enjoyne, according to the Word of God.

Mat. 7 12. *As you would that men should doe unto you, so doe unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.*

Page 3. *Wee will not receive impression of any forced construction of the Covenant: compare this with Page 17.*

Will you never leave falsifying? where doe you finde any such expression in the Remonstrance, either in Page 3, or 7. as this is, *viz.* we will not receive impression of any forced construction of the Covenant? The House of Commons in their late Declaration of the 17 of *Aprill*, 1646. doe say, *Wee expect that the people of* England *should not receive impressions of any forced construction of that Covenant*; and in obedience thereunto, the Remonstrants doe say in page 2 and 3 of the Remonstrance, that in pur-

suance of that Noble resolution of this Honourable House, for the due observation of the Covenant, and their expectation of conformity of the people of *England* thereunto, expressed in the late Declaration, we doe resolve by the grace of God not to receive impression of any forced construction thereof; and is it now become an acting in a direct, evident and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God, for the Common-Councell to professe their resolutions to yeeld obedience to the desires and expectations of the House of Commons, in their not receiving impressions of any forced constructions of the Covenant?

I desire your leave here also in a parallel way to set downe the Scripture by you here brought, and another branch of the Propositions sent by both Houses of Parliament to the King; and to desire your judgement, whether that also be in a direct, evident and obvious manne against the expresse Will and Word of God.

WORD OF GOD.

Mat. 7. 12 *As you would that men should do unto you, so do unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.*

Propositions of both Houses of Parliament, *Article* the 6th.

For as much as both Kingdomes are mutually obliged by the same Covenant, to endeavour the neareſt conjunction and uniformity in matters of Religion: *That such unity and uniformity in Religion according to the Covenant, as after consultation had with the Divines of both kingdoms now assembled, is, or shall bee jointly agreed upon by both Houses of Parliament of* England, *and by the Church and Kingdom of* Scotland, *be confirmed by Acts of Parliament of both Kingdomes respectively.*

CITY REMONSTRANCE.

Mat. 7. 12. *As you would that men should doe unto you, so doe unto them, for this is the Law & the Prophets.*

The 4 Petition, That no person disaffected to Presbyterian government (*saith the Remonstrance, set forth, or to be set forth by the Parliament, but according to your usuall course, this to blind the reader you still leave out*) may be employed in any place of publike trust; *and then you add, which is not at all in that Petition, these words:* viz. *But some effectual course setled to proceed against such persons, as in the 3 Petition*, where there is not the shadow of a word tending to any such purpose.

I confesse the words you cite are in the 2d. Petition, but not at all in the least manner applyed to persons onely disaffected to Presbyterian government, for there is no such word in that Petition, nor any thing looking that way; neither doth the *Common-Councell*, in any part of their Petitions so much as desire that persons onely disaffected to Presbyterian government, should by some effectuall course setled, be proceeded against; and therefore methinks you should have been a little more considerate, before you should thus falsly and unjustly have charged the *Common-Councell to act in a direct, evident, and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God.* This I will grant you, that in the second Petition the *Common-Councell* doth desire, that all Anabaptists, Brownists, Heretiques, Schismaticks, Blasphemers, and all *such Sectaries* as conforme not to the publike Discipline established, or to be established by Parliament, may be fully declared against, and some effectuall course setled for proceeding against *such Persons*, but is there no difference between Anabaptists, Brownists, Heretiques, Schismaticks, Sectaries, and persons but disaffected to Presbyterian government? I pray tell mee your minde plainly, would you have Heretiques and Blasphemers, *viz.* such as deny the Scriptures to bee the Word of God, such as professe the Scriptures are writings onely probable to be beleeved as the Story of King *Henry* the eighth; such as deny the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of Essence, such as call the Trinity a three headed *Cerberus*, such as deny the Divinity of Christ, such as deny the immortality of the Soule, and such as deny that there is a God, or say, if there bee a God, the Devill is a God, such as say God is the author of sin, such who hold that all men shall bee saved, yea, and the Devills too, such as say that Christs humane Nature is defiled with Originall sin as well as ours, such as hold that all Religions, Worships, Consciences, whether Paganish, Jewish, Antichristian, &c. should bee tolerated: would you have these tolerated, or would you not have some effectuall course setled for proceeding against such Persons? or doe you thinke these to be no more dangerous, if permitted to broach these Heresies and Blasphemies in the Kingdom, then to permit persons otherwise every way peaceable, godly, and orthodox, because meerly disaffected to Presbyterian government?

I desire here also in a parallel way to set downe the Scripture by you here brought, and a Vote of the *House of Commons* of the 30 *July*, 1641. and to desire your judgement, whether that also be in a direct, evident, and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God.

WORD OF GOD.	Vote of the House of Commons, *die Veneris* 30 *Julii*, 1641.
Mat. 7. 12 *As you would that men should doe unto you, so doe unto them; for this is the Law and the Prophets.*	Resolved upon the Question. *That this House doth conceive that the Protestation made by them, is fit to be taken by every person that is well-affected in Religion, and to the good of the Common-wealth: And therefore doth declare, That what person soever shall not take the Protestation, is unfit to bear Office in the Church or Common-wealth.*

Thus having given you these Articles of the Propositions of both Houses of Parliament sent to the King for a safe and well grounded Peace, and the other passages of both or either House of Parliament, which I have placed after your example, in a parallel way, against the Scriptures by you brought, and desired your judgement whether these also do act (as you would have the world beleeve the Petitions in the Remonstrance doth) in a direct, evident, and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God. I pray you now also seriously to consider of those Petitions in the Remonstrance, and compare them together, with these Propositions for Peace, and the other passages of both or either House of Parliament, and then tell mee what the Remonstrants in those three (so much by you condemned) Petitions, for the substance of them, did more desire of the Parliament, then both Houses of Parliament have now proposed to the King, or hath been formerly by them in these passages of both or either House of Parliament declared to the world.

Then you say, *Presbyteriall government is not in the Covenant, therefore an interpretation, and this* (say you) *you inforce upon others, though you will receive no forced construction of the same your selves.*

Answ

Answ. Where did the Remonstrants say that Presbyteriall government was in the Covenant? and if they never said it, as they never did, why doe you here bring it in as if they had said it? I hope that at last you will learne to forbeare falsifying. It is true, that in page 2 of the Remonstrance, they speake of Ordinances for Presbyteriall government; and I thinke you will not deny but there are such, if you doe, I will produce them; but though Presbyteriall government be not nominally, and *in verbis* in the Covenant, yet I hope without offence, it may be said that it is concordable to the Covenant, as being neareſt to that government which the beſt reformed Churches doe practiſe, and that by our Covenant we are bound to endeavour the ſettlement of. And that progreſſe which both Houſes of Parliament have already made in, and towards the ſettlement of Presbyteriall government, they have done it in purſuance of the ſaid Covenant, as by their owne words in the Ordinance of the 14 of *March*, 1645. it doth appear, *Viz. The Lords and Commons aſſembled in Parliament being very ſenſible of the great duty which lyeth upon them to ſettle matters concerning Religion and the worſhip of Almighty God; and having continually before their eyes the Covenant, which they have ſo ſolemnly taken for the performance thereof, and the manifold motives and incouragements thereunto, which are given them from God himſelfe by a ſpeciall hand of Providence, powring forth daily mercies upon them; In diſcharge of their duty, and in purſuance of the ſaid Covenant, and in thankefulneſſe to God for all his Mercies, have diligently applyed themſelves to that work of his Houſe, by his grace and aſſiſtance they have made ſome progreſſe therein, notwithſtanding the exigency of other affaires, accompanied oftentimes with great and imminent dangers. And notwithſtanding the great difficulty of the worke it ſelfe in divers reſpects, and particularly in the right jointing of what was to be ſetled with the Lawes and Government of the Kingdome, the want whereof hath cauſed much trouble in this and other States; yet by the merciſull aſſiſtance of God, having removed the booke of Common-prayer, with all its unneceſſary and burdenſome Ceremonies, and eſtabliſhed the Directory in the roome thereof, and having aboliſhed the Prelaticall Hierarchy, by Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and their dependants, and in ſtead thereof, laid the foundation of a Presbyteriall Government in every Congregation, with ſubordination to Claſſicall, Provinciall, and Nationall Aſſemblies, and of them all to the Parliament.*

Why doe you also wrong the Remonstrants, in saying, *They force Presbyteriall government upon others*? doe they any other thing then Petition the Parliament to settle that government which in the words of this Ordinance both the *Lords and Commons* do say, *that in discharge of their duty, and in pursuance of the said Covenant, they have laid the foundation* already, *viz.* of a Presbyteriall government.

You have yet one parallel more:

WORD OF GOD.	CITT REMONSTRANCE.
Deut. 19.15 *At the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every thing be established.*	That Quarterman may be brought to some exemplary punishment for the affront done by him, &c. And then you say, *Though no such thing was ever proved by one witnesse or testimony, that what he did was any affront done to the Priviledges and Government of the City, Hang him, hang him, what hath he done?*

Answ. You deny not the act of *Quarterman*, I presume it is not that which you say was never proved by one witnesse or testimony, for the act was done at high Exchange time, within the sight and hearing of many hundreds; but I conceive your meaning (for you doe not expresse it, and therefore I can but guesse at it) is, that the act in entring the City, and making proclamation therein with sound of Trumpet, without acquainting the Lord Major therewith, was not proved by one witnesse or testimony to be any affront done to the Priviledges or Government of the City, there never was any the least exception taken against the Order to proclaime, nor against the matter proclaimed, nor the time when, nor the place where the Proclamation was made; if according to the constant and uninterrupted course of transacting things of that nature, the *Lord Major*, who is the chiefe Magistrate of the City had but been acquainted with it. Now I appeale to the Reader, whether such an act done in such a manner in the sight and hearing of many hundreds, without acquainting the *Lord Major* therewith, be not an affront done to the priviledges and government of the City.

In page 14. you tell the Reader, that *I except against the replyer,*

for

for saying, The Parliament hath promised in severall Declarations a gracious respect to tender Consciences.

Answ. In page 9 of my Vindication, I cited out of the Replyer, page 2, these following words, *viz. That it is notoriously known that the Parliament did promise in severall declarations, a gracious respect to tender Consciences.* I did not except against him for so saying, but I told him then, and I tell you now, that I will not say that this is false, lest I should fall into that sin, which I am forced so frequently to reprove you for; but if there bee any such promises in former Declarations which I yet remember not, as I then said to him, so I now say to you, you should have done well to have expressed the date of those Declarations, and the words of the promises, that so the Reader might see, that at least in something you, I say you, as well as the Replyer, desire to deale fairly with them; for the Remonstrants they still laid a fair Copy before you in the Remonstrance, so to have writ after them.

And now without shewing any one Declaration more then the Replyer did, you goe on and say, *It seems you are willing to hide your eyes from such observations in the Parliaments Declarations, as though they were an abomination to you, that they should have any respect to tender consciences.*

Answ. I never knew before, that a desire to know the dates of the Parliaments severall Declarations, and to see the words of the promises which they therein make, of a gracious respect to tender consciences, which the Replyer saith, is so notoriously knowne, (and which I must confesse as then, so now, I remember not,) had been a manifestation of a mans willingnesse to hide his eyes from such observations in the Parliaments Declarations. And it is so farre from being an abomination to me, that the Parliament should have any respect to tender Consciences, that I shall much rejoice both in the beholding of any true tendernesse of conscience in any man, and at all due respect which the Parliament shall shew unto them.

Yet can I not conceive that Heretiques that deny there is a God, or that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that they are no more to be believed then the Stories of *Hany* the 8th, &c. or Blasphemers, which call the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of Essence, a three headed *Cerberus*, &c. that these, and such as

these,

these, can properly be brought in under the notion of tender consciences.

But then you aske me if *I have forgotten the last Declaration of the* 17 *of* April, 1646. *Answ.* You know that neither the Remonstrants, nor yet my self have forgotten that Declaration, for it is by the Remonstrants in their second page, cited as a Noble resolution of this Honourable House for the due observation of the Covenant: and their expectation of the conformity of the people of *England* thereunto expressed in that Declaration, and it is by me in the tenth page of my Vindication quoted as a justification of the Remonstrants (who to answer the expectation of the House of Commons manifested in that Declaration in these words, *viz. Wee do expect that the people of* England, *should not receive impressions of any forced construction of that Covenant*) doe professe that they doe resolve by the grace of God not to receive impressions of any forced construction thereof. But what is this one Declaration to that the Replyer saith, *that it is notoriously known that the Parliament did promise a gracious respect to tender Consciences in many severall Declarations*, or what is it to that which you doe say, *viz. Were I as well furnished with Books as your selfe, doubtlesse I cou'd shew you severall other Declarations, where they promise a Christian respect to tender Consciences.*

Then you goe on and say, *I am sorry Mr. Bellamie, you should be so apt now adayes to cast out of your memorie the praise-worthy Acts of the Parliament.*

Answ. He say no more in this either to the Replyer or your selfe, but that I would desire you not to take it amisse, because I remember not that which yet he saith is so notoriously known, and that which you say, were I well furnished with bookes, doubtlesse I could shew unto you, but yet at this while neither hee, nor you, can, or at least doth shew mee any one instance of any other Declaration, and therefore do now intreat you at present to forbeare your sorrow, and for after-times not to be so censorious as to charge me to be so apt now adayes to cast out of memory the praise-worthy Acts of the Parliament; All those praise-worthy Acts, I hope whilst I live, I shall be as ready to commemorate as *Mr. L. P.* who without any ground charges mee to be so apt now adayes to cast them out of my memory.

In

In your 16 page you thus goe on, speaking to me, *viz. In the next place you begin with an interrogation, as if you had gotten a Commission to inst't; thus;* What? *is Londons care to keep the Covenant, now become Londons ruine, &c. Doubtlesse these are Doctrines of a new date, and neare akin to those new Lights, which so many now adayes doe so much boast of.* And then you say, *Whither now Mr.* Bellamy? *I professe my heart akes, and my hand trembles, shall I write, or shall I forbeare? I passed by your scoffing at new Lights once before at* pag. 10. *and tooke no notice of it; but I meet with it againe, yea, with an additionall scoffe, Doctrines of a new date, and new Lights, &c.*

Answ. When I resolved to indevour the Vindication of the City Remonstrance, I resolved with my selfe, that I should meet with oppositions, and therefore desired so to carry on the worke, as not willingly to let a phrase fall from me, that might justly give any cause of offence, and to that end, my care was to weigh words as well as matter, well knowing that sweet and pleasing language, with solid reason and strong arguments, best conduce to the carrying on of a controversie.

I confesse, that as in *p.* 10. so here, I use the word new Lights, and Doctrines of a new date, but whether in the least appearance as a scoffe or a jeere, I freely leave to the Reader both to examine and censure; for as scoffing and jeering are farre from my disposition, so I can safely say, they were as farre in this from my intention. I desire the Reader to take a survey of the passages immediately preceding these expressions, as they are transcribed out of the Moderate Reply, and judge whether I had not just cause to speake what ever is there spoken; the expressions are these, *viz. That the Remonstrants doe discourage the Parliament, and that they presse them in all haste, unto a sudden enfeebling of their strength, by crushing a considerable party of as cordiall friends as ever they had since the Wars began.* And that, *because they will not sweare a submission unto that Church-government, which* (say you) *neither they, nor your selves yet understand, and to make so ill a requitall of their Winters worke.* And then againe, *Shall the whole Kingdome, that was almost ready in all its Quarters to congratulate with* London *for all its love, now threw by these thoughts, and with sad hearts, and pale faces, tell their wives and children, friends, and neighbours, Woe and alasse,* London *will ruine us,* London *begins to decline the Parliament,* London *begins to close*

with the King, London *is ſtill'd with Malignant language,* London *remonſtrates to the Parliaments prejudice,* Londons *City is* Englands *woe.*

Now I pray conſider whether theſe ſo many, ſo foule, and yet withall ſo falſe charges ſhall bee laid againſt *London,* and that for their performance of what by Covenant they are ſworne unto, doth not juſtly occaſion theſe interrogations; and let the Reader judge whether my uſing of them gave you any cauſe to ſay, that I begin with them, as if I had a Commiſſion to inſult, and whether from theſe, and my calling them Doctrines of a new date, wch. whether they be ſo or no, the Reader will eaſily diſcerne. And my ſaying that they are neare akin to thoſe new Lights which ſo many now adayes doe ſo much boaſt of; which I therefore did, becauſe they which doe now adayes ſo much boaſt of their new Lights, are the perſons which doe thus calumniate *London* for this their Remonſtrance, and are the prime men which vilifie the Covenant, as in ſundry particular inſtances in my Vindication I made it good. I ſay, pray conſider, and let the Reader judge whether all or any of theſe things gave you any juſt occaſion thus to rake up, as you have done, reports againſt mee, whether true or falſe, and to publiſh them to the whole World, as in your 16 17, 18, 19, 20, & 21 pages of your Book, and ſo almoſt all along to the end you have thus done, leaving the argument in difference between us, and falling upon ſome perſonall things, which you ſay have been reported to you concerning my carriage in matters of Religion: Ile come to the particulars; firſt, you tell the Reader the place of my birth, and that *I was borne a Son of the Church of* England *under Epiſcopacy*: Truly, if this bee a fault or error, I conceive Mr. *J. P.* will not deny himſelfe to bee guilty of the ſame crime. Then you come to the manner of my breeding, the time of my comming to *London*, and my being bound an Apprentice to Mr. *Nicholas Bourne, Citizen and Stationer of London*: and you tell the Reader how my carriage was for the time of my Apprentiſhip, which you are pleaſed thus to expreſſe, *Exerciſing ſuch ſkilfulneſſe and exactneſſe in keeping and preſerving that rich jewell of a quiet and tender conſcience, &c.*

Anſw. What is this either to the City Remonſtrance, or to my Vindication thereof? theſe are the things now in debate between

tween you and mee; but your thus elevating mee up in praiſes in this, and ſome ſuch other paſſages in your Book, is only to caſt me downe with the greater violence, ſo farre as you can, to my defamation and deſtruction; but I pray conſider (and let your owne heart bee your owne Iudge, for I will not accuſe you) whether your dealing with me in this, be not juſt like the Devils with our Saviour Chriſt, *Matth.* 4 5,6. who tooke him up to the Pinnacle of the Temple, that ſo, if it were poſſible; hee might breake his neck by throwing him down to the ground.

But ſay you, my tenderneſſe of conſcience appeared, *In that I would not perſonally ſell ſuch Bookes (as Prayer-books) which were ordinarily ſold by other Stationers, and in my Maſters Shop.*

Anſ. Mr. *J. P.* you and the Reader ſhall both ſee by this firſt particular, what credit either you are to give to the reports you have heard of me, for there is not any one thing that you deliver upon your knowledge, but all upon heare-ſay; and you know the old Proverbe, *Famoſiſt mendax*, or what little regard is to bee had to what you all along in this, and in other particulars have written of mee; for as you have delivered them, I ſolemnly profeſſe, that to the beſt of my knowledge and remembrance there is not one of them true. I confeſſe that neither my ſelfe, nor any of my fellow Servants did ſell any Play-books, or other books in that nature; and our not ſelling theſe, was by my Maſters owne order and direction, and that upon ſuch good grounds, as I know you neither will, nor can queſtion. But for the particular which you inſtance in, *viz. Prayer-books*, there is but one man living that I know of, that can teſtifie any thing upon knowledge concerning my practiſe in this particular, and that is my Maſter *Mr. Nicholas Bourne*, who was concerned in it, and therefore his teſtimony is the more conſiderable: Ile give it you in, as an anſwer to what in this you have Printed upon the Credit of your reporters, and that in his own words written to mee in a Letter upon the ſight of this paſſage in your Book; it thus follows:

This 24. of *July*, 1646.

Mr. Bellamie,

This day there came to my hands, a Booke called the City Remonſtrance Ramonſtrated, where in pag. 16. *I find you are accuſed, that when you*

were my Servant you would not ſell Prayer-books: To which I anſwer, to prove the contrary, that I know you never refuſed to ſell any Prayer-books; and that I printed a Prayer-book, called The Supplications of Saints, *of which I doe beleeve you ſold ſome hundreds: And this I teſtifie under my Hand the day and yeare above written.*

Per me Nicholas Bourne.

The next thing you fall upon, thinking thereby to defame me, is, *That after I ſet up Shop for my ſelfe, the buſineſſe of Infants Baptiſme grew into debate; and* (ſay you) *I then fell into the Opinion of the Anabaptiſts, &c.*

Anſw. Mr. *J. P.* I am ſorry you ſhould ſo eaſily entertain reports without ground, and ſo freely publiſh them to the World, knowing nothing of them; hee that told you this, if hee knew what it was hee ſaid unto you, knows, that as unto the point of time hee told you an untruth. I confeſſe, that many years before this, even when I was not above 17 yeares of age, I did upon ſome ſcruples put into me by an Anabaptiſt, entertaine their opinion, but I bleſſe God, it was not above a moneths time before the Lord diſcovered my error to mee. It is now above 30 yeares ſince, and muſt this be raked up afreſh by you, and throwne in my face to blemiſh what you can that which I have written in defence of the Remonſtrance? Is this a carriage becomming a ſober Chriſtian? one ſolid argument, or good reaſon, if you had them to give, againſt the Remonſtrance or its Vindication, would with wiſe men bee more regarded, then twenty ſuch uſeleſſe or vaine reports.

Then you tell the Reader *of my applying my ſelf to a ſeparate Congregation*, and of my continuance with them, and the manner of departing from them; and all this you affirme, it ſeems, as upon your owne knowledge, for you doe not in all this ſay as in others things, it is reported ſo, but poſitively affirme the particulars to be ſo.

Anſw. I am ſure you know nothing more, nor leſſe, of all that in this you have written, for the time you relate to, was neare twenty yeares before you and I ever ſaw the faces one of another, but to ſhew you your miſtake, and to let it appeare how you are abuſed in receiving, and have abuſed mee in divulging

of

of these things, Ile give you and the world, (being as it were thus by you called thereunto) a true account of them, It's true, I did above thirty yeares since apply my self to that Congregation, whereof Mr. *Jacob* was then Pastor, with whom I continued in Communion all the time he continued in this Kingdome, and some yeares after: but that this was then as you affirme *a Separate Congregation*, I deny, and for proof of what I say, I appeale to the confession of the faith of the said Congregation published in print, in *Anno* 1616. Which was a little after the time applying my self, as you call it unto them, in which it doth appeare that Separation was then witnessed against by that Congregation, and the judgement of that Congregation then was that the pub'ique Congregations in this Kingdom, was the true Churches of Christ, the Ministery thereof as received by the people, a true Ministery, the Ordinances there administred, both of Baptisme, the Lords Supper, &c. the true Ordinances of Jesus Christ, and that wee not onely might, but in some respect ought to joyn in Communion with the said publique Congregations in the said Ordinances, and that not so to doe was our sinne. Ile give it you for your present satisfaction in the very words of the printed confession of the Faith of that Congregation, Article the eleventh, the latter end of it, thus it is. *It being no evill, nor any appearance of evill, justly in us to joyne to the Parish-Congregation and Ministery in such respect, and so far forth only as is aforesaid, wee ought, (as wee believe) sometime on wright occasion so to joyne, and wee sinne if wee doe not.* This printed confession of Faith I have by mee, and am very ready for the cleare and full confirmation of what in all this I write, to shew to you, or to any one that desires satisfaction in the truth of what I affirm.

And as it was then the judgement of that Congregation, so was it also then the practice of the members thereof. And for the proofe of this, I appeale first to so many of the then members in generall of that Congregation, who are now living, and knew the Churches practice in this particular, and in speciall to Mr. *Sabine Staresmore*, who, (I conceive, and that upon good grounds) hath been one maine instrument by mis-reports to have thus misled you, and therein abused mee: but if it bee so, God give him grace to see his sin, and forgive it him, or whoever it was; I

truſt, my heart ſhall never with conſent, entertaine ſo much as the ſhadow of a thought to make the like requitall; but I will ſtudy and indeavour, and lay hold upon every opportunity which the Lord ſhall hold forth unto mee, to doe all the good I can to him, to them, to you, for this your evill done to mee, remembring what our Saviour Chriſt hath taught mee, *Matth.* 5. 44. *Love your enemies, bleſſe them that curſe you, doe good to them that hate you, and pray for them which deſpitefully uſe you, and perſecute you.* But I beſeech you all ſeriouſly to conſider, that if this bee not perſecution with the tongue, then tell mee what is. And I pray you conſiderately to ponder and weigh well that of the Prophet *Jeremy* 20. 10. and make ſuch uſe of it to your owne ſoules, as God ſhall direct you to doe; the words are theſe, *I heard the defaming of many, feare on every ſide, report, ſay they, and wee will report it, all my familiars watched for my halting, ſaying, Peradventure hee will bee enticed, and we ſhall prevaile againſt him, and we ſhall take our revenge on him.* But my comfort and ſtay in this I truſt ſhall be the ſame with the Prophet, in that, manifeſted in the next verſe, *But the Lord is with me as a mighty terrible one, therefore my perſecutors ſhall ſtumble, and they ſhall not prevaile, they ſhall bee greatly aſhamed, for they ſhall not proſper.*

I further appeale for proofe of what I affirme, unto Mr. *Henry Roborough*, now one of the Scribes of the Aſſembly of Divines, and Paſtor of *Leonards Eaſtcheape London*, whether hee hath not at that time obſerved that Mr. *Jacob*, *and other knowne members of that Congregation, did uſually communicate in the Ordinances of Chriſt in the publike Congregations*: And whether hee hath not with his owne hands, adminiſtred *the Lords Supper to Mr.* Jacob, *and other then knowne members of his Church.* And that the members of this Congregation, did then not onely communicate in the publique Aſſemblies in the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, but alſo in the *Sacrament of Baptiſme*, yea, that they did *baptize their owne children in the publique Aſſemblies*; I appeale for the truth of this, unto the teſtimony of ſo many of them as bee now living, and remember the Churches practice in this particular at that time, and if there bee none now living that can remember, and will teſtifie this, then in particular I appeale to the Regiſter Book of *Andrew Hubbard London*, whether upon the 7 of December, 1623. there

was

was not then and there baptized, *Susan the daughter of* Robert Lynell, *and of* Susan *his Wife*, both which was then Parishioners of that Parish, and *members of this Congregation*, and *Robert Lynell a Deacon of the Church*. I further appeal unto the Regi ter-book of *Saviours Southwarke*, whether upon the third of *February*, 1624. there was not then and there baptized, *Bershua*, the daughter of *Daniel Ray*, who then was a Parishioner of that Parish, and a member of this Congregation. I could produce many others in the like kind, but these may suffice to confirme the truth of what I affirme, neither would I have printed this, but for the witnesse of this truth, *viz. That that Congregation did then hold it not onely lawfull, but of necessity, upon pain of sin, according to the Printed Confession of Faith, to communicate in the publike Ministery and Ordinances, and that both of Baptisme and the Lords Supper.*

Neither do I write this in the least measure, to reflect upon the present now members of that Congregation, if in their judgments and practice they now walk otherwise; provided, that by the warrant of the word of *God* they can clearly justifie their present walking; but I must crave your favor for my self stil to continue in the same judgment and practice I then was, and which is concordable to the then Confession of the Faith of the Church, as unto communion in the Parish Congregations, both in the Ministery and Ordinances of Baptisme and the Lords Supper, though you falsely charge me of mutation and change in so doing. And thus I hope I have shewed you your mistake in that you affirm, I applyed my self to a separate Congregation. I shall also endevour to give you as ample an account of the just reason (as I humbly conceive) of my leaving them.

Mr. *Jacob* leaving *England*, and going to *Virginia*, the Congregation was then for a time, to the best of my remembrance, left without a Pastor: and then many of the members of the said Congregation varying in their judgements from what was in the *Confession of the Faith of the Church* formerly printed; and being now both in judgement and practice against *Communion in the Ordinances of Christ in the publike Congregations, which by the Confession of the Faith of the Church, we were bound upon pain of sin to maintain, both in judgement and practice*; this occasioned many disputes, and some differences, at last the point of *Ordination of Ministers* came

under

under debate, which was the first, yea, the onely occasion that put a thought into my breast about my departing from that Congregation: And at that time Mr. *John Lothrop*, a learned, holy, humble, and painfull Preacher was the Pastor, then the Congregation ordered three of their members to conferre with mee about that difference, I then did, now doe, and ever will acknowledge their great love, and tender respect to mee in it, but after sundry Conferences, and wee not agreeing, I thought it my duty, to signifie my mind in writing under my hand to the whole Congregation, which I then did in these words:

To his dearly beloved Christian Friends Mr. John Lothrop, *and all the rest of the Congregation with him assembled, this publikely present.*

Christian Friends, and dearly beloved in the Lord Jesus Christ, having by the Congregations appointment had Conference with three of the Brethren, about a point in controversie, which wee cannot agree, I thought it my duty to signifie my minde in writing to the whole Congregation, which is, That after many thoughts spent, and some paines taken in Conference, and examination of Scriptures, and searching the judgements of Divines, both ancient and moderne, about the matter in controversie, *viz. Ordination*, or the compleat investing of persons chosen by the free consent of the Congregation into those Offices (for Ministeriall imployments) unto which they are elected, I conceive for the Reasons following, this to be the truth, *viz.* That it ought to bee performed actually by precedent Church-Officers.

1. Because that the Apostles in *Acts* 6. finding the Church to be in want of Officers, gave them direction for the performance of what was their duties, tending to the obtaining of the aforesaid wants, which was to elect persons qualified according to direction, which they, *viz.* the Congregation did, & reserving the other of compleat stating them into their Offices, unto themselves, which they, *viz.* the Apostles effected: the texts for confirmation, which with a single eye I desire to be considered of, are, *Acts* 6. *v.* 3. for the precept injoyning the duty, and *v.* 5, and 6. for the duty in obedience to the precept performed, the words are, *Chuse you out whom we may appoint*, not chuse you and appoint.

2. That

2. That which the Apostles reserved in this place to themselves in their precept to the Congregation, and accordingly after practised, as in the first appeareth, so also in other Congregations or Churches they did the like, as *Acts* 14. 23, *When they had ordained them Elders in every Church*, they, that is, *Paul* and *Barnabas*, as appeareth *v.* 12, 14.

If it bee objected, that this was done by Officers extraordinary, which had their Calling and Commission immediatly from God, and therefore is not fitly brought so, as to require the like to bee done by ordinary Officers: I desire for answer to it, this third reason may be considered.

3. That which in this kind was done by the Apostles, which I grant were extraordinarily called by God, and gifted accordingly, the same was after done by them which had their ordination by ordinary Officers in Churches, as *Timothy* and *Titus*, as appeareth, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. where *Timothy* was ordained by the hands of the Company of the Eldership, and he in particular, and not the Congregation in generall, is *charged before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, to lay hands suddenly on no man*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21, 22. which Scripture, with submission to better judgments, I conceive teacheth these two duties.

1. That *Timothy* an ordained Officer ought to lay on hands in Ordination, and not any other but Officers ordained.

2. That they that doe Ordaine, ought to doe it with advisement and great deliberation, *not preferring one before another partially*.

And as *Timothy*, so *Titus*, as testifieth the Apostle, 1 *Titus v.* 5. *was left at* Creta *to ordaine Elders in every City*: And for my part, I am ignorant of any one example in all the new Testament, where Ordination was performed by any but Church Officers; and for the clear and distinct understanding of the quality and difference of Church Officers extraordinary and ordinary, that we may know which is which, I desire that this Scripture may bee considered, *Gal.* 1. 1. *Paul an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ*; where the Apostle to prove his Apostolicall, or extraordinary Calling, affirmeth that hee was not an Apostle of men, neither by man, for then hee had been but an ordinary Minister, but by Jesus Christ; and so as his calling was extraordi-

nary, his Office is the like; from whence followeth this inference, that such as is the calling, such is the Office, they that had their calling immediately, was extraordinary Officers, such was the Apostles, & such as have their calling mediately, or by means are ordinary, such was *Timothy*, as in the fore-quoted Scripture may appear, and so are all such as have their Ordination by preceedent Church Officers. This interpretation I so give, as upon a better manifested, I shall desire to retract this.

4. If it had been in the power of the Congregations as to elect, so lawfully and without sinne to Ordaine, the Apostle might have written from place to place, Letters of direction according to which, Congregations might have proceeded, and so of themselves effected it, and then the Apostles by that might have had the more time for the publishing of the Gospel of Christ in other places, where yet they had not been, and not have travailed so many miles back againe from place to place to Ordaine Elders, which if lawfully it might have been omitted, it would have spared them much paines, and much advanced the publishing of the Gospel, for wee see that when the Church omitted another Ordinance, *viz. Excommunication*, the Apostle went not to them, but sent to them to doe it, 1 *Cor.* 5.

5. That which the holy Ghost maketh two distinct Ordinances in Churches, and commands them to bee performed by persons of a twofold or distinct consideration in Churches, that none ought to confound, or make them one Ordinance, neither ought they to be performed by Churches otherwise then by the persons in the said twofold or distinct considerations.

But the holy Ghost maketh *Election* and *Ordination* two distinct Ordinances in Churches, & commands them to be performed by persons of a twofold or distinct considerations in Churches, *viz.* *Election* by the members, *Ordination* by the Officers, *Act.* 6. 3.

Therefore none ought to confound, or make them one Ordinance, neither ought they to bee performed by Churches otherwise then by the Persons in the said twofold or distinct considerations.

These things thus considered, prove this Conclusion, That that Church or Churches which hold and enjoy their Church Officers any otherwayes, then by the Ordination of former

Church

Church officers hold and enjoy them not according to the mind of Christ, and all the administrations of such Church Officers, their manner of entrance into their Office, not being grounded on Scripture, are unlawfull, and not to bee communicated with; and this is the ground of my withdrawing my selfe from that Congregation with whom I formerly walked.

If it bee objected, I formerly made question of this same particular, and yet after that walked with the Congregation again. I answer, that it is true, and that I did upon this ground, as to some it's evidently known.

After some question with the Congregation about it, one of the members, who formerly also had doubted of the same thing, at last said, hee was stayed for the present upon this consideration; That if the Ordination of the Church without Officers, were not of force to give a compleat being by Ordination to a Pastor, yet our Pastor having formerly been Ordained by a precedent Ministery, in that respect his Ministery was true, and his Administrations lawfull; unto which, as willing to embrace any truth manifested, I assented, and upon that ground, and no other, I received his Ministery, and partooke in, and communicated with his Administrations, and this not secretly, but professedly.

But after that, I being in trouble, and in probability to be questioned about my practise in this particular, I was, as some know, in mind much troubled, for having withdrawne my selfe from the Publike Assemblies, and yet enjoying in my own judgement, and by my owne confession, neither Ministery nor Administrations, but what derivatively I had from them; and also professing both the Publike Congregations, and Ministery, and Ordinances, to be the true Churches Ministery, and Ordinances of Christ, and so farre pure, as for mee to refuse communion with them, even by the publike Confession of that Congregation with whom I walked, was a sinne: I could not then, neither can I now tell which way, without a great deale of scandall, to take upon mee, before authority in these respects to cleare my practice, or to reconcile this at least seeming Paradox, the rather considering, that in this particular I was not onely left alone by the most and best of Orthodox Divines, Foraine and Nationall, but even

by that Congregation also with whom I walked, who though it hold a necessity of communicating in the Assemblies in some cases, and that as before the Churches Ministery and Ordinances be true, yet hold not their Ministery in their owne, by vertue of Ordination from a precedent Ministery, but by the Ordination of the Congregation, unto which, neither could I then, nor can I now, for the Reasons fore-specified give my assent, but must remaine contrary minded till the force of the Reasons and Argument be taken away, or a beter ground bee manifested to mee, which at all times I shall desire to embrace. Thus desiring what truth herein is contained may be received, and what error, if any, may be shewed, that all of us by leaving the evill, and doing the good, may obey our God in whom I rest; desiring ever to be a true Friend and Brother to you all, and to all others that love the Lord Christ.

John Bellamie.

After the sending of this Letter, I received an answer from the Congregation, and returned them a Reply, a Copy of which Reply I have now by me, but upon desire, I delivered back the Answer to one of the members, and would now have obtained it againe, and printed it with my Reply to it, but it would not bee granted me. I would not have printed these passages, but that I conceived it requisite to satisfie you and the reader the grounds of my leaving that Congregation. And after this, (what further passed in that Congregation concerning my selfe) I know not. Now, if that Congregation with whom I then walked, was afterwards in their judgements and practice changed or altered, from what the Confession of the Faith of the Church then was when I joyned to them, and the practice of the members thereof then was, while I walked with them, as unto communion in the Ministery and Ordinances both of Baptisme and the Lords Supper, &c. in the Publike Parish Congregations (for that is the expression in the Confession,) and that not thus to communicate, in such respect, and so farre forth onely as aforesaid, was our sin, even by our own confession; then I pray you tell me (for I wil not judge) whether is most blame-worthy, they or I, and in whom is most mutation to be found.

But

But if I may without offence speake it, methinkes you exceed the bounds of Christian love and charity (yet will I not call it, a piece of your Independent justice which we must expect, as in another case you call it, *a piece of Presbyteriall justice, which* (say you) *wee are like to finde from you when power is in your hands*, pag 4.) in presuming that revenge against this Congregation and its members, hath put me thus on worke in the *City Remonstrance* and *its Vindication*, for the Lord that searcheth the hearts of all men, knoweth my heart, and unto him I doe appeale, that from that time to this houre, which I thinke is now near twenty years, I never had the least thought of revenge in me, either against the whole, or any particular member of that Congregation, but have according to my poore ability, been alwayes ready and willing to performe all offices of Christian love and respect unto any of them; and I hope, as occasion is offered, ever shall be; and though I cannot agree with them in opinion and practice, yet I hope I shall ever love them as my own soul.

In page 18. you speak of my meeting with a select company of Christians in a cursory way; where you are pleased to say more then ever I deserved, or had cause to thinke of, concerning my carriage amongst them to their comfort and content.

Answ. Truly, I blesse God, I have often met with sundry select Companies of godly Christians in holy duties, and been willing, according to the best of my abilities, to doe or receive any good to, or from them, but sure I dare not think you judge this to be criminall; but yet you say, *that with much griefe of soul they assert these things*. What your meaning in this is, as you expresse it not, so indeed I know it not; I hope, as I ever have done, so I ever shall endeavour to do or to receive any spirituall good from any company of Christians with whom either purposely or occasionally I shall converse; and for this you have my minde and judgement, which according to that talent God hath given mee is, and ever shall be concordable to my practice; you may read it in my Vindication, page 21. it is in an answer to a Querie of the Replyer, *viz.* what the Remonstrants meane by private and separate Congregations; it's answered negatively in these words, *That the Remonstrants doe not mean by private and separate Congregations, the private meetings of Christian people for Prayer, Exhortation,*

Repetition of Sermons, or any other laudable and Christian familie, or neighbourly duties amongst the Saints; as to these I am assured all the Remonstrants will joyne with you in your desire, that abhorr'd both by God and all good men, may all requests be that shall bee made for the suppressing of these.

Next, you goe about summarily to reckon up such things, as either lying fame hath told you, or your own fancy dictates to you, and for fear of failing, you repeat them in several places; and therefore where you are pleased to lay them downe, I must undergoe the paines to take them up, they are in page 19, and page 30. where you say, I have been for Bishops, and against Bishops; for Separates, and against Separates; a Sectary, and an Anti-sectary; a Schismatick, and an Anti-schismatick; and so you goe further on in many other the like expressions according to your pleasure.

Answ. If all these were true which here you specifie, and all the former particulars before recited, yet what are all, or any of these to the City Remonstrance or its Vindication? Truly, I must needs say, that it is a shrewd signe of a bad Cause; and I thinke the Reader will bee of the same minde with mee, when in stead of Arguments or Reasons to confute what is affirmed, you must fall so foule upon the Person, and the supposed miscarriages of him whom you oppose; it seems you had little hope that your selfe by strength of Argument should doe any good, and therefore you call in for helpe, such as it is, in this way of combating to cast mee downe, just like the Heathens against the Christians in the Primitive times, and the Papists against the Protestants in these latter times; but I pray remember what you say of the Reply, in the 5 page of your Booke, the latter end, That *there may possibly be mistakes more then enough* in it, *for the holy Scripture onely excepted, where is that writing without mistakes?* May not the like bee said, as of Books, so of men, where is the man without his errors, without his miscariages? as I will not accuse, so I beleeve you will not excuse Mr. *J. P.* himselfe from these. And truly, for my self, I dare not to these plead my defence; for I know more by my selfe, then you, or all your Reporters can accuse me of, and earnestly & humbly I desire that God may be glorified both in my acknowledgement of them to him, and his pardoning

ning of them to mee; but upon what ground you should thus boldly breake in upon mee, knowing nothing of any thing that of these you affirme, I can but wonder: I pray be pleased to make a second inquiry amongst all your Reporters, and see if they can make it out for truth unto you, that ever at any time, in any place, either by word or writing, any thing fell from mee, either for Bishops, for Separates, for Schismaticks, or for Sectaries, and if not, as confident I am nor you, nor they can, then why doe you wrong your selfe and your Cause, in thus going about to wrong me, by reporting and divulging these untruths of me?

But I have tyred out my selfe, and perhaps wearied the Reader too, in following you so long upon these personall things, yet must I needs crave favour to particularize one passage more, *viz.* in your 29 pag. in these words, *viz. Mr.* John Bellamie, *what kinde of man are you? They that observe your sayings what they have been formerly concerning the King, concerning the Lords, concerning the power of the Commons, (whispering your thoughts in the eares of many that now speake of it) what your carriages have been not very long since in Common-Councell, or among your brethren the Stationers, the Committee appointed for the keeping up and maintaining the Expository Lectures, and what your carriages are now, stand with admiration and amusement at your wheeling thus about.*

Answ. I desire the Reader to observe the many Charges which in this you lay against mee, at the least six, yet you particularize not any one; might I not more justly then you, take your owne words used in reference to *Quarterman*, in your 12 page, and apply them to that which in this you spake against mee, *viz. Hang him, hang him, what hath he done?* And what I pray you may such as know mee not, be ready to judge of mee? when they heare so many, and so great Charges in the generall laid against mee, and seemingly confirmed by so many Witnesses, as the whole Common-Councell, the Company of Stationers, the Committee for Expository Lectures? was there ever the like passages printed against any man by the worst of enemies that ever he had to charge him with something against the King, as if that were Treason, something against the Lords & Commons, as if that were either Treason, or at least *Scandalum Magnatum*, and this to be whispered by mee in the eares of many, that now speeke of it againe,

and

and yet to instance in nothing at all; and then further to say, what your carriages have been not very long since in Common-Councell, or among your Brethren the Stationers, the Committee appointed for the keeping up and maintaining the Expository Lectures. Now I appeale to your own soule, whether this your dealing can have any defence made for it. And I do appeale also to the worst of Enemies that I have alive (as it seemes I have a great many; for I thanke you heartily for it, you told mee privately by word of mouth upon Saturday the 8 of this August, that there is a Booke of the History of my life, already drawn up, and fitted for the Presse, wherein are many heavie Charges laid against me in the matters of my conversation:) to make any thing good against mee in any of these generalls which here you speak of, and in particular I appeal to the Court of Common-Councell, to the Company of Stationers, and to the Committee appointed for the keeping up and maintaining the Expository Lectures, (for all these you seeme to bring as witnesses against me,) whether ever I did or spake any thing at any time in any of these Assemblies, which in any thing was any way crosse or contrary either to the City Remonstrance, or to any thing in my Vindication thereof: for you say, that they observing your now carriages, stand with admiration and amasement at your wheeling thus about.

Mr *J. P.* I pray remember that Scripture, which in your 12 page you set in a parallel against a passage in the Remonstrance, to prove that the *Common-Councell doth act in a direct, evident, and obvious manner against the expresse Will and Word of God*, and bring it hither, and set it likewise in parallel against this your dealing with me, and then tell mee *who doth act in a direct, evident, and obvious manner, against the expresse Will and Word of God*; the Scripture you cite, is *Matth.* 7. 12. *As you would that men should doe unto you, so doe unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.* Mr. *J. P.* I beseech you aske your owne soule, whether you would that I, or any other man should deale thus by you, as you have dealt by me, gathering up whatever you cou'd heare against mee, whether true or false, in my carriages about matters of Religion, and that for above 30 yeares together; and though you know nothing of any one of them more or lesse, and there being not one of

them

them true as you relate them, yet without ever ſpeaking one word to me about them, with ſuch boldneſſe and confidence of truth to publiſh them to the world: And now tell me, *Whether you doe as you would bee done unto, and whether in this, your owne Conſcience being your judge, you doe not act in a direct evident, and obvious manner againſt the expreſſe will and word of God.*

But I muſt break off, yet with this reſolution, that your indeavour thus to blazon my Name, and blaſt my Repute, ſhall by Gods grace quicken mee up to a more Chriſtian watchfulneſſe over all my wayes, that I may walke more inoffenſively towards men, and more pleaſingly before *God*; and I bleſſe my *God*, that my Name is neither in the power of your tongue, nor pen, nor yet of your reporters neither, but onely in the hand & power of my good God, who is able to keep that which I have committed to him; and I bleſſe his Name, I am not in any thing terrified by that which you or they have in this already done, in thus ſeeking to defame mee, nor yet, I hope, ever ſhall bee at that Hiſtory of my Life, which you ſay is ready for the Preſſe to be Printed againſt mee.

Next, you come in your 22 page to that queſtion wherein reſides the Supreme power of the Kingdome, and upon this Argument you continue neare to the end of your Book; and in page 23 you begin your Queries, and firſt, you aske what I meane by three Eſtates, and yet in the ſame, and the foregoing pages you tranſcribe my very words, where I told you, that by the three Eſtates I meant (as all the Laws and Records of the Kingdome expreſſe it, and as all men unqueſtionably have hitherto concluded it, and as the truth in it ſelfe is) *the King, the Lords*, and *the Commons*. Your ſecond Querie is, *What I meane by Fundamentall*; and then you tell the Reader, that *I ſay the King, the Lords, and Commons are the three Eſtates of which the Fundamentall conſtitution of the Kingdome is made up.*

It's true, I did, and doe ſay ſo ſtill, and you ſay little to contradict it, onely you aske another queſtion (which, how wiſe a one it is, I deſire the Reader to obſerve, for I muſt not judge) *viz. are there three Fundamentalls?* and you propoſe it, as if I had ſaid or imply'd ſo much; and then you tell the Reader, you ever thought there had been but one; and in this I agree with you, but herein is our difference which you and I muſt leave to the judge-

ment of the reader to determine, I ſay this one Fundamental conſtitution of the Kingdom, is the three Eſtates of the *King*, *Lords*, and *Commons*, and this I ſtill abide by; but you ſay, *this one Fundamentall is the Commons*, and that for two Reaſons; 1. *Becauſe the Commons made the King, and the King made the Lords, and ſo the Commons are the prime foundation.* 2. *Becauſe both the King and the Lords were advanced for the benefit, quiet, and welfare of the Commons, and not the Commons made for them*: And you ſay, *if you are deceived, the common Maxime of* Salus populi ſuprema Lex, *deceived you.*

Anſw. Firſt, the frame of the Government of this Kingdome, by the admired wiſdom of the Architects and Contrivers thereof, is ſo compoſed of theſe three Eſtates, as may beſt preſerve the whole, and keep either of thoſe Eſtates from any ſuch exorbitancy as might deſtroy the other; for as they are the three Eſtates in Parliament, I humbly conceive there is no ſubordination of the one to the other, but a co-ordination of them all three together, by which the Princes Soveraignty, and the peoples freedome and liberty are together preſerved and maintained, and herein is that common Maxime of *Salus populi ſuprema Lex*, chiefly made good.

Secondly, the legiſlative Power of this Kingdom is not in any one Eſtate diſtinct, but in al the three Eſtates conjunct, yea, the very root and eſſence of this Legiſlative Power is compounded, and as it were, mixed together in the three Eſtates of *King*, *Lords*, and *Commons*, and theſe three concurrent Eſtates producing one ſupreme Act as con-Cauſe, cannot have a ſubordination among themſelves, it not being imaginable how a power can cauſe the ſupreme effect, and yet be ſubordinate: thus the very being of our Common and Statute Lawes prove this truth, for they are not compoſed nor enacted by any one of the three Eſtates *diviſim*, but they are eſtabliſhed by the ſole authority of the three Eſtates *conjunctim*, every act *being enacted by the Kings moſt excellent Majeſty, and by the authority of the Lords and Commons aſſembled in Parliament.*

Thirdly, I muſt needs diſſent from you, in that you ſay, that both *the King and the Lords were advanced for the benefit, quiet, and welfare of the Commons*, if your meaning bee, as indeed by your words it ſeems to be, *excluſive*, excluding therein the benefit, quiet

an

and welfare of *the King* and *the Lords*, for I conceive the benefit quiet and welfare of the whole, *viz. King, Lords*, and *Commons* was equally and alike intended in *the Fundamentall constitution of the Kingdome*, and so the *Commons* were as well made for the *King*, as the *King* for the *Commons*, yea the *King*, and *the Lords*, and *the Commons* were all alike made for the benefit, quiet, and welfare each of others, and so of the whole together; and this is that, which in my minde maketh the Constitution of this Kingdome in this state of a limited and mixed Monarchy farre to surpasse the Constitution of any other Kingdome that I know; and I think, that in a good sense it may truly bee said of the severall members of this thus constituted *Politique body of this Kingdome*, as the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 12. 21. speakes of the members of *the naturall body*, *the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee, nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you*; for as every member in the naturall body is by God there set and placed, not alone for its owne good, but for the welfare of the whole, and accordingly it acts, and is serviceable therein for the good of the whole, yea, such a naturall necessity there is in the body, of every member, that not any one member can be wanting, but the body is thereby defective, and so *the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee, nor againe, the head to the feet, I have no need of you.*

So in the *body Politique of this Common-wealth*, by the ancient and excellent Constitution thereof, the three Estates, *viz. King, Lords* and *Commons* are so set and placed, that in their severall stations they should not act alone for their owne particular, but for the Common and Publike good and welfare of the whole; yea, I humbly conceive, that to the upholding & continuance of this so excellent a Constitution, there is such a *Politique necessity* of every one of the three Estates in this Commonwealth, for the preservation of the whole, that *the King cannot say to the Commons, I have no need of you, nor againe the Commons to the King, I have no need of thee*, nor yet the King *and the Commons to the Lords, we have no need of you*: For if any one Estate in *this body Politique* be cut off, the whole constitution is presently destroyed; and when I seriously consider how by the Fundamentall Constitution of this Kingdom, there is such care taken for the preservation of the Soveraignty of the *King*, and yet withall such provision made for the just Liberties

and freedome of the people, and how the one may be juſtly allayed, and yet conſiſt without impeachment of the other, I cannot but conceive it to be unparalleld for true policy in the whole world: and thus much in anſwer to your two firſt Queries.

Your third Querie is, *whether the King, and ſuppoſe the major part of the Lord, which make up two Eſtates, doe agree together, ſuppoſe it be to ſet up abſolute prerogative, and the Commons will not aſſent hereunto, whether the major part of the Eſtates muſt not conclude the minor, the two conclude the third, and ſo as for the Commons, will they, nill they, ſlaves they muſt be, and ſlaves they ſhall be.*

Anſw. To the making of a Law, there muſt bee the concurrent conſent of all the three Eſtates, *viz. King, Lords,* and *Commons*; the *King* and the *Lords*, without the conſent of the *Commons* can make no Law valid, and in that caſe the *major* part of the Eſtates doe not conclude the *minor*, and ſo the *Commons* are thereby preſerved from ſlavery; but in another caſe the *major* part of the Eſtates doe conclude the *minor*, *viz.* when *the Lords* and *Commons* doe agree upon a Law for the good and ſafety of *the Kingdome*, then *the King* is concluded in that their agreement, and ought to ſet his *fiat* thereunto: For *the Kings of England* are bound by their Oaths to grant ſuch Laws which ſhall bee for the good and ſafety of *the Kingdome*, with the accord of their people *in Parliament* preſented to them, as in the preamble of the Statute made in the 25 yeare of *Edward* the Third, entituled, *The Statute of proviſors of Benefices, made at Weſtminſter*, in theſe words it doth appeare:

Whereupon the ſaid Commons have prayed our Soveraigne Lord the King, that ſith the Right of the Crowne of England, *and the Law of the ſaid Realme is ſuch, that upon the miſchiefs and dammages which happen to this Realme, Hee ought, and is bound by His Oath, with the accord of His People in His Parliament thereof, to make remedy and law.*

And the *King* acknowledgeth this for a truth, and accordingly Acted, as in theſe following words in the ſame Statute, it appeareth:

Our Soveraigne Lord the King, ſeeing the miſchiefes and dammages before mentioned, and having regard to the Statute made in the time of his Grandfather, and by ſo much as Hee is bounden by His Oath to cauſe the ſame to be kept as a Law of His Realme, &c. by the aſſent of all the great

Men

Men and Commonalty of His said Realme, to the honor of God, and profit of the said Church of England, *and of all His Realme, hath Ordained and established, &c.*

Thus farre the words of that Preamble and Statute, upon which *the Lords* and *Commons* in this present *Parliament* assembled say thus: *Viz.*

Here the Lords and Commons claime it directly as the right of the Crowne of England, *and of the Law of the Land, that the King is bound by his Oath, with the accord of his people in Parliament, to make remedie and Law upon the mischiefs and dammages which happen to this Realme, and the King doth not deny it,* Collect of Declarations, p. 225. Let this suffice as answer to your third Querie.

Your fourth Querie is this, *Whether hee* (viz. the King) *be present as a distinct Estate, if so, if one distinct Estate may bee present in power* quatenus, *an Estate, and absent in person, may not a second Estate be so present, though absent in body; yea, a third Estate so present, and yet absent in body; and so we shall have thre Estates in Parliament, and not a man amongst them; this is a Riddle indeed Mr.* Bellamie, *I pray you unfold this also.*

Answ. At your request Ile undertake the taske; your owne words grant, that as well in Parliament, as in all his inferiour Courts of Justice, *the King is present in his power*; these are your words, *viz. I know Sir, hee is present in power in all his inferiour Courts of Justice, as well as in the Parliament*, 24. Now in *Parliament* there is no power but the power of the three Estates, *viz. King, Lords,* and *Commons*; and therefore all the Acts that are enacted by the power of *Parliament* are enacted by the power of the three Estates *conjunctim*; It is possible that the *King* may withdraw his person from the *Parliament*, as now hee hath done, but hee can never withdraw his power, no, not his power as a distinct Estate, for in the making of every Act of *Parliament*, there is present in *Parliament* the power of all the three Estates, without all which *conjunctim*, no act can bee made. But there is an Act made this Parliament by the free consent of all the three Estates in Parliament, that this Parliament shall not be dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned without the consent of both Houses of Parliament first had and obtained, *viz. Anno* 17 *Caroli Regis*, entituled, *An Act to prevent inconveniences which may happen by the untimely*

adjourning, proroguing & dissolving of this present Parliament. In wch Act are these words, *viz. Be it declared and enacted by the King our Soveraigne Lord, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, That this present Parliament now assembled, shall not bee dissolved, unlesse it be by Act of Parliament to bee passed for that purpose, nor shall be at any time or times during the Continuance thereof, prorogued or adjourned, unlesse it be by Act of Parliament to be likewise passed for that purpose.*

Now then thus I argue, if at the passing of this Act of Parliament, there was present the power of all the three Estates in Parliament, *viz King, Lords,* and *Commons,* and by vertue of this Act of Parliament, the Parliament cannot be dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned, unlesse it be by act of Parliament to bee passed for that purpose, then the power of all the three Estates, *viz. King, Lords* and *Commons* must needs continue in Parliament, till by Act of Parliament to be passed for that purpose this Parliament bee dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned.

But at the passing of this Act of Parliament, there was present the power of all the three Estates in Parliament, *viz. King, Lords* and *Commons,* (*vide the Act ut supra*) and by vertue of this Act of Parliament, the Parliament cannot be dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned, unlesse it be by Act of Parliament to be passed for that purpose, *vide* also the Act *ut supra.*

Therefore the Power of all the three Estates in Parliament, *viz. King, Lords* and *Commons* must needs continue in Parliament till by Act of Parliament to bee passed for that purpose, this Parliament be dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned.

And thus the particular by me affirmed, is clearly proved, *viz. That though the person of the King bee absent from the Parliament, yet the power of the King,* viz. *as one of the three Estates in Parliament, is present with the Parliament.*

I now come briefly to the second part of your Querie, and will endeavour herein, (as you call it) to unfold your Riddle; the other two Estates in Parliament, *viz. Lords,* and *Commons,* cannot be absent from the Parliament, neither in power, nor yet in person: thus farre Ile grant you, that many of the members of either House may bee absent from either of their respective Houses, and yet the two Estates of Parliament continue entire

in

in Parliament, for there muſt be at leaſt three Lords preſent in the Houſe of Lords to make it a Houſe, and ſo an Eſtate in Parliament; and forty Commons with the Speaker, in the Houſe of Commons to make it an Houſe, and ſo an Eſtate in Parliament; and therefore there cannot bee, as you affirme, three Eſtates in Parliament, and not a man amongſt them; and this I give as an anſwer to your fourth Querie, and if you pleaſe, you may alſo let it paſſe for the unfolding of your Riddle.

In the fifth place, in page 24. you have theſe words, *viz. The Replyer obſerving the Remonſtran s aſcribing onely a ſhare of the ſupreme Power to the Houſe of Commons propoſeth this Queſtion to them; Will not you allow ſo much power to the Kingdome repreſentative, in reference to the Kingdome, as to the repreſentative City, in reference to London?* And then you come to your fifth Querie in theſe following words, *viz. And ſo doe I Querie, will not the Commons of London yeeld or aſcribe unto the Commons of England, as the Commons of London to themſelves will aſcribe?*

Anſw. I pray mark the termes of your Querie, for methinks it is a little defective; you ſay the Commons of *London*, not the Common-Councell, but as you propoſe your Querie, I anſwer affirmatively, that the Commons of *London* will yeeld and aſcribe unto the Commons of *England*, as the Commons of *London* to themſelves will aſcribe; but I ſay again, obſerve your termes, you ſay the Commons of *London*, not the Common-Councell; I ſhall preſently ſhew you the difference, the Commons of *London* are not the City repreſentative, but the Common-councell, (which doth conſiſt of the Lord Major, Aldermen, and Commons) is the City repreſentative.

Then you goe on in theſe words, *viz. Therefore Mr.* Bellamie *to make your abſurdities the better appeare, in your parallel between the Kingdome repreſentative, and the City repreſentative, I come upon you thus;*

Firſt, you grant that the Common-Councell is the City repreſentative, page 2 of your Vindication.

Anſw. I grant it.

Secondly, you grant that the Houſe of Commons in Parliament aſſembled, is the Kingdom repreſentative, in the ſame page.

Anſw. I grant the Houſe of Commons in Parliament aſſembled,

bled, to be the Kingdome repreſentative in that ſenſe in which in page 2 of my Vindication, I ſaid it was, *viz.* as it is made up of and choſen by the Kingdome collective, *viz.* the Commons of the Kingdome, whom in Parliament it onely repreſents, and therefore onely can be the repreſentative body of them, and accordingly in all their addreſſes to the Houſe of Lords, they goe in their owne names, and in the names of all the Commons of *England*; and deſiring the concurrence of the Houſe of Lords in any Act, they deſire it in their owne names, and in the names of all the Commons of *England*, of whom they onely are a repreſentation, or whom they doe repreſent, and in that ſenſe I expreſſed it in page 4, where I called the Kingdome collective, the body of the Commons of *England*, not the body of the Kingdom of *England*; And as this repreſentative body, *viz.* the Houſe of Commons, is one of the three Eſtates in Parliament, ſo alſo in that page I called it the Houſe of Commons in Parliament aſſembled, but I called it not the Parliament; ſo the Lords are called the Houſe of Lords in Parliament aſſembled, but no man cals that Houſe the Parliament. Likewiſe the Lords and Commons joyning together in any one Act, as, in the laſt Propoſitions ſent to His Majeſty, it is ſaid to be agreed by both Houſes of Parliament, as in Article 1, 5, 6, 12, &c. it appeareth, but it is not ſaid to be agreed by Parliament, for if it had been ſoagreed, why then is the Kings aſſent to theſe Propoſitions prayed for by both Houſes of Parliament, as in the Proem to the ſaid Propoſitions in theſe words it doth appeare? *Viz.*

May it pleaſe your Majeſty,

We the Lords and Commons aſſembled in the Parliament of England, *in the name, and on the behalfe of the Kingdoms of* England *and* Ireland, *and the Commiſſioners of the Parliament of* Scotland, *in the name, and on the behalfe of the* Kingdome *of* Scotland, *Doe humbly preſent unto your Majeſty, the humble deſires and Propoſitions for a ſafe and wel-grounded Peace, agreed upon by the Parliaments of both Kingdomes reſpectively, unto which we do pray your Majeſties aſſent, and that they, and all ſuch as ſhall bee tendred to your Majeſty in purſuance of them, or any of them, may bee eſtabliſhed and enacted for Statutes and Acts of Parliament by your Majeſties Royall aſſent in the Parliaments of both Kingdoms reſpectively.*

You

You might also have observed in the same page, that when I come to speake of making Laws, which is the worke of the Parliament, and not of any particular Estate alone in Parliament, I there say in expresse termes, the Kingdome representative, which is the Parliament.

And sure no man could possibly imagine that my expression should be taken in any other consideration; for I did all along in the 14,15,16,17,18 pages of my Vindication also hold out this truth, that there was three distinct Estates in Parliament, *viz. the King, the Lords*, and *the Commons*, and doe you thinke that it was probable or possible that I should meane, that one of the three Estates in Parliament, should be a representation of all the three?

Thirdly, you say, the City representative hath a power to make a Law for those whom it represents.

Answ. I grant this too.

Then you thus goe on, *viz. Fourthly, I desire to know whether you allow the Kingdom representative the same power to make a Law for those whom it represents.*

Answ. I crave your favour and patience before you goe any further to present you in this place with these two following considerations:

First, that the House of Commons, all the members thereof being chosen by the collective body of the Kingdome, *viz.* the Commons, are in that respect, and in that sense truly the representative body of the Kingdome, *viz.* of the Commons of the Kingdome, and so have in them in this consideration, the full Legislative power of the Commons of *England*.

Secondly, I pray also consider, that though the House of Commons have in them the full Legislative power of the Commons of *England*, yet the whole Legislative power of the Kingdome of *England*, is not concentred in the Commons of *England*; but is, (as hath before been fully proved) in the three Estates of *the King, the Lords*, and *the Commons of England conjunctim*, and therefore no one Estate alone, and by its selfe can make a Law; but to the making of every Law in the Kingdome of *England* there must be the concurrent consent of all these three Estates *conjunctim*.

And this as I humbly conceive, makes a cleare way to give an answer to your Querie, *viz. Whether you allow the Kingdom repre-*

senta-

ſentative (*viz.* the Houſe of Commons) *the ſame power to make a Law for thoſe whom it repreſents*, and the anſwer will bee this; It hath in it the full *legiſlative* power of *the Commons of England*, whom *in Parliament* it doth repreſent, but it hath not in it the full *legiſlative power of the kingdome of England*, it hath in it all the power of *the Commons of England* towards the making of a Law, but it muſt have the concurrent conſent of the other two Eſtates, *viz.* of *the King*, and of *the Lords* to the full conſummating of a Law, and making it obligatory to *the Kingdome of England*.

And beſides, that it is thus ſetled by the fundamentall Conſtitution of the Kingdome, I humbly alſo conceive that there is juſt reaſon for it too, and that not onely from the relation which theſe three Eſtates have one to another, but alſo becauſe of that intereſt which one Eſtate hath in another.

The King being no otherwiſe *King of England*, but with relation to *the ſubjects of England*, and ſo he hath an intereſt in them; and they are his *liege*, that is, his lawfull Subjects, or, his Subjects according to the Law. And likewiſe *the Lords* and *Commons of England*, are no otherwiſe *Subjects of England*, but with relation to *the King*, as hee is *the King of England*, in whom alſo they have the like reciprocall intereſt, and ſo he is their *liege*, *our lawfull Soveraigne*, *or their King according to the Law*, and thus runs the formes of our Laws, *viz. Bee it enacted by the King our Soveraigne Lord, with the aſſent of the Lords and Commons in this preſent Parliament Aſſembled.* But the City of *London* by the Charter of *Edw.* 3. in the 15 yeare of his Reigne, hath a power granted *to the Major, and Aldermen, and their ſucceſſors, with the aſſent of the Commonalty, to make lawes for the common profit of the Citizens of the ſame City*; by vertue of which grant, *the Lord, Major, Aldermen, and Commons in Court of Common-Councell aſſembled*, being therin as one entire Court, *the repreſentative Body of the City*, doe to this day make Laws, which are alwayes binding to the Citizens of the ſame City. And there is no other conſent required to the conſummation of theſe Laws, but the ſole and onely authority of this Court, and therefore all our Acts of *Common-councell* are made in the joint names of the *Lord Major, Aldermen, and Commons in the Court of Common-councell aſſembled*, and by the authority thereof; and in the addition of any branch in an act of *Common-councell* it is ſtill thus

ex-

expreſt, *It is by this Court further Ordered, &c. Or this Court doth further Order, &c.* which doth fully prove that all the power of making or altering, or adding to the City lawes, reſts wholly and alone in the body of that one *Court of Common-councell*, or the greater number of them, which doth alwayes conſiſt of *the Lord Major, Aldermen, and Commons*, but all the power of making or repealing, or adding to the *lawes of the kingdome*, doth not reſt wholly and alone in *the Houſe of Commons*, but the concurrent conſent of the other two Eſtates, *viz. the* King, and *the Lords*, is neceſſarily required to this of *the Commons*, for making or repealing of *the Laws of the kingdome*. And thus I hope I have anſwered your firſt head of Queries ariſing from that queſtion, *viz. wherein reſides the Supreme power of the kingdome.*

I ſhall now likewiſe endeavour to give a ſolution to your Argument, and all the ſatisfaction I can to the ſecond head of your Queries.

For a foundation to build your Arguments upon, you produce an Argument of mine out of my Book, entituled, *A Plea for the Commonalty of London*, thus it is, *That Court which hath a power to make a law, and by that law to conferre a power upon the Lord Major and Aldermen, which as Lord Major and Aldermen they had not before, muſt needs bee* quoad hoc, *as unto the making of a law, above the Lord Major and Aldermen.*

But this Court of Common-councell hath, &c. Ergo, *this Court of Common-councell ſo farre as to the making of a Law muſt needs bee above the Lord Major and Aldermen.*

Anſw. I owne the Argument, and for confirmation of what I there affirmed concerning the power of *the Court of Common-councell*, I made it good, and proved it *de facto*, by an act of *Common-councel* made in the ſixth yeare of *Hen.* 7. upon the 15 of *Aprill*, concerning the *choice of the Chamberlaine of* London, *and the Bridge-maſters of the City*, as by reference to the ſaid Book appeareth, and I would willingly ſee what you have to ſay againſt it.

But upon this in your 25 page you thus argue:

That Court which hath the power to make a law, and by that law, to conferre a power upon the King, and Lords, which as King and Lords they had not before, muſt needs be quoad hoc *unto the making of a law, above the King and Lord.*

But the Houſe of Commons, which ſay you (ſpeaking of mee) is the kingdome repreſentative, even as the Common-councell is the City repreſentative upon your ſuppoſition, hath a power, &c. Ergo, the Houſe of Commons, ſo far as unto the making of a law, muſt needs bee above the King and Lords.

But I pray you tell me, is there no difference between the Court of Common-councell, and the Commons in Common-councel? I told you even now in page 42 that the Lord Major, Aldermen, and Commons in Common-councell aſſembled being therein one entire Court, are the repreſentative body of the City, I never ſaid the Commons in that Court were ſo; and if you had been pleaſed to have peruſed that Booke of mine you cite to this purpoſe, and out of which you take my argument, *viz. The Plea for the Commonalty of London*, in page 10. where I inſtance in four ſeverall acts of that Court, *viz.* the removing of Deputy *Alden* from the Court, Mr. *John Wilde* from being Town Clerk, Mr. *Tho. Wiſeman* from being the City Remembrancer, and divers Aldermens Deputies from their places of Deputyſhip, you might there have found, that I thus conclude it, *viz. And all this by the joint and concurrent power of the Lord Major, Aldermen, and Commons in this Common-councell aſſembled.*

And what though the *Court of Common-councell*, which alwayes conſiſteth of *the Lord Major, Aldermen, and Commons*, have a power to conferre upon the *Lord Major and Aldermen* that power, which as *Lord Major and Aldermen* they had not before (as I fully proved, and therefore without the leaſt mutation am ſtill of the ſame mind) and in that reſpect, as unto the making of a Law are above the *Lord Major* and *Aldermen*, as the whole is above a part: But will it hence follow that *the Commons in Common-councell* alone and by themſelves, have either this power to conferre a power upon *the Lord Major and Aldermen*, which as *Lord Major and Aldermen* they had not before, or that they are above them: If you will argue from my aſſertion, bee ſure you keep my terms, and then ſee how it will advantage you for the confirmation of your argument.

I grounded this power of making City Laws from the Charter of *Edw.* 3. in the 15 yeare of his Reigne. And in the ſame Booke of mine, out of which you took my argument, you might alſo

have

have had my authority for it, it is in page 7 in these words; *We have granted further for us and our heires, and by this our present Charter confirmed to the Major and Aldermen of the City aforesaid, that if any customes in the said City hitherto obtained and used, be in any part difficult or defective, or any thing in the same newly happening, where before there was no remedy ordained, and have need of amending, the same Major and Aldermen and their successors, with the assent of the Commonalty of the same City, may adde and ordaine a remedy meet, faithfull, and consonant to reason, for the common profit of the Citizens of the same City, as oft, and at such time as to them shall be thought expedient*; which Charter was confirmed by act of Parliament 43 yeares after, in the 7 of *Rich.* 2. Now if you can produce the like authority granted alone to *the House of Commons* by *the Parliament*, that they of themselves, without the consent of *the King* and *the Lords*, have power to make lawes for the *Kingdome*, as by this Charter the Lord Major, Aldermen, and their successors, with the assent of the Commons of *London*, have for the City, then you hit the business aright indeed, but otherwise I thinke your argument is not true: And therefore for after times, let me advise you, that if you will imitate an argument in the words of it, be sure you imitate it also in the prooses of it, and let them be as full and cleare for the confirmation of what you affirme; for it is not words, though never so smooth, that proves any thing in matters of fact, as this is: And truly, should I have laid down that argument to prove the power of *the Court of Common-councell*, as unto the making of *City lawes* to bee above the *Lord Major*, and *Aldermen*, and not have proved it *de facto*, by the acts of the *Court of Common-councell*, I should have thought it at least to have been a *scandalum Magnatum*, against the Lord Major and Aldermen, and very blame-worthy in my selfe to have done it. But perhaps you think the condition of *the King*, and *the Lords* to bee such, as that whatever you speak or publish concerning them, tending to the annihilating *of their legislative power and authority in Parliament*, can neither be an offence to them, nor a fault in you, or if it bee, it seemes you regard it not; but I hope you will not take it amisse, if, as I did in that, so I desire you in this, either to produce a proof *de facto*, to make good that the *House of Commons* hath by an Act of that House alone conferred a power upon the *King* and *Lords*

as *King* and *Lords* they had not before, which are the very words of your argument, or else in plaine English to tell the Reader, that though you can transcribe the words of my argument, which a childe of ten yeares old can doe as well as you, yet now upon second thoughts you must needs confesse you come very short in a parallel proofe of it, there neither now being, nor never was any act of the House of *Commons* that doth prove that, that House alone and by it selfe did ever make a law which did confer a power upon the *King* and *Lords*, which as *King* and *Lords* they had not before, and without this proofe, I perswade my selfe no man will beleeve, that as unto the making of a law the House of *Commons* is above the *King* and *Lords*, though Mr. *J. P.* affirmes it to bee so. And this I give not onely as a solution to this your argument, but also to the other arguments which follow, *viz.* concerning the power of the House of *Commons* alone without the *King* and *Lords* to repeale what lawes they think meet, and to make laws and rules for all the Courts and people in *England* to bee steered and acted by, and whereunto (say you) the *King himselfe is bound by his Oath, and therefore ought in duty to consent*; and likewise to that which you say will follow from my logick, *viz.* *that the Kingdome representative is inferiour in its power, in reference to the government of the Kingdome, then the City representative is in reference to the government of the City*, and to the other Queries which you ground upon them, for they all alike hang upon this string, and if in the opinion of the Reader, to whose judgement I referre it, this be cut asunder, I am sure they must all then needs fall to the ground, and therefore I shall not need to trouble my self any more with them.

And now Mr. *J. P.* I have endeavoured with all the candor and tenderneſse I could to examine your Book, and have not I hope, let one word fall from mee, that in the least measure doth reflect upon your person, for it is the matter of your Book, and not any of your personall infirmities (for, alasse the Lord knows, I have work more then enough to meddle with, and to master my own) or other your supposed errors in matters of Religion that I encounter with. And if we cannot yet agree in this present difference and debate, my earnest desire is, and I trust my endeavour shall for ever be answerable thereunto, that wee may

manage the matter with that ſweet moderation and temper of Spirit as becommeth Chriſtians, for of this I am confident, that though through weakneſſe or error in judgement, perhaps mine, not yours, we cannot agree together to live in one Church fellowſhip or communion here upon earth, yet we ſhall for ever mutually enjoy communion and fellowſhip with God the Father, with Chriſt, with the bleſſed Spirit, three Perſons in one Eſſence, and with the holy Angels, and the glorified Saints for ever in heaven. And therefore I beſeech you while we yet live here in this vale of teares, let us remember and obey that counſell the Apoſtle gives us, *Philip.* 3. 15, 16. *Let us therefore, as many as bee perfect bee thus minded, and if in any thing you bee otherwiſe minded, God ſhall reveale even this unto you; neverthelesſe, whereunto we have already attained let us walke by the ſame rule, let us mind the ſame thing.*

I ſhall gladly imbrace and entertaine any truth of God, which ſhall by you bee held forth unto mee with the warrant of his Word, and as willingly leave and forſake whatever either in opinion or practice I now hold or doe that ſhall bee made apparent to be diſſonant thereto; for I ſolemnly profeſſe unto you, that I labour not for Maſteries, neither deſire I to give the laſt blow, I eſteem it no ſhame to be conquered, when Chriſt proves the Victor, nor no loſſe to bee vanquiſhed when the Truth prevailes, for it's verity, not victory that ſhall be my comfort.

A POSTSCRIPT.

I Have at this time no more to ſay, either to your ſelfe, or to your Book, but in one word to let the Reader know, that my deſire and endevour to afford you all the faire quarter that poſſibly I could in this our Conflict about this Subject, was ſuch, That I did upon Saturday the 8 of this inſtant *Auguſt*, in the preſence of Mr. *Samuel Clarke* Paſtor of *Bennet Fynch*, *London*, and of Mr. *James Story*, and Mr. *Henry Overton*, two of yours, and of my owne acquaintance, ſhew you in Writing this my Juſtification of the City Remonſtrance and its Vindication, before ever I tendered it either to be Licenſed, or Printed, and deſired you to peruſe

use it, and if there were any thing in it either for matter of Fact, or otherwise, that you could justly except against, I would expunge it, and it should never see the light; And when you would not accept of that offer, I then read some passages in the Epistle to you, which I told you, that in my apprehension, they were the things which most nearly concerned your Person; this I did to manifest my unwillingnesse to let any thing passe from mee, that might bee either prejudiciall to the Truth, or justly distastefull to your Person, and if it be possible, to overcome evill with good.

FINIS.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

In the absence of the Author these following Errata's escaped in the printing of the Vindication, *which I pray thus Correct.*

Page 2. line 23. for you will charge, read, *you will not charge*; p. 6. l. 30. for and Sectaries, r. *of Sectaries*; p. 7. l. 1. for till, r. *the*; p. 8. l. last, for stated, r. *sacred*; p. 14. l. 22. for finde in, r. *finde it in*; l. 24. for these their words, r. *these are their words*, p. 23. l. 27. for elected, r. *erected*; p. 26. l. 24. for ones Poesie, r. *own Poesie*.